



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/583,571	06/19/2006	Michel Leger	09669/091001	8880
22511	7590	06/25/2009		
OSHA LIANG L.L.P. TWO HOUSTON CENTER 909 FANNIN, SUITE 3500 HOUSTON, TX 77010			EXAMINER CALLAHAN, PAUL E	
			ART UNIT 2437	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 06/25/2009	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@oshaliang.com
buta@oshaliang.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/583,571

Applicant(s)

LEGER ET AL.

Examiner

PAUL CALLAHAN

Art Unit

2437

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 June 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 15-20 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6-3-2009 has been entered.
2. Claims 1-20 are pending and have been examined.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 6-3-2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant argues that the claims, as now amended, may be distinguished from the teachings of Yokoyama 6,279,825 because the reference fails to teach the features of a principal means combined in a protected box and peripherals combined into a non protected box, wherein the non protected box excludes the protected box. However, a review of Yokoyama shows that such an arrangement is taught in fig. 1, 2, and col. 4 lines 23-31 where a protected box: element 1 in figures 1 and 2, contains the principal means, and where the peripherals: element 102 in figures 1 and 2: LCD screen, are contained in a non protected box. The Examiner considers that the non-

protected box "excludes" the protected box as per a reasonably broad construction of the term since the two boxes are designed to be separately disassembled and physically seal off components into two distinct regions of space.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yokoyama, US 6,279,825 (Submitted with the Applicant's IDS), Parsons et al., US 7,121,460, and Devanbu et al., US 6,098,170

As for claim 1, Yokoyama teaches a secure terminal (abstract) comprising: principal means processing means, memories for storing data and programs, and a keypad for entering data (fig. 2, col. 4 lines 33-61), wherein elements constituting said principal means being interconnected by a first data bus and are combined in a protected box which is impossible to dismantle without deterioration of at least one element of said principal means (fig. 2, fig. 3, col. 4 line 61 through col. 6 line 65, see esp. col. 5 lines 15-25 "fine wiring"); and peripherals of the principal means comprising: means of reading from/writing to a card means of access to a telecommunications network (fig. 2, col. 4 lines 33-61), and power supply unit for supplying power to the

principal means and the peripheral means (col. 4 lines 4-50), wherein elements constituting said peripheral means being interconnected by a second data bus and are combined in a non protected box (fig. 2, fig. 3, col. 4 line 62 through col. 6 line 65); wherein the non-protected box excludes the protected box (figures 1 and 2: elements 1 and 102, col. 4 lines 23-31). Yokoyama does not explicitly disclose a peripheral that is a printer. However Parsons does disclose a secure ATM where a non-secure peripheral that is a printer is shown (fig. 7: "Output Devices", col. 5 lines 40-55). Therefore it would have been obvious to incorporate this feature into the system of Yokoyama. It would have been desirable to do so since this would allow the user to obtain a hard copy receipt for transactions made at the ATM. The combination of Yokohama and Parsons does not explicitly disclose that the first and second boxes are connected by means of a single connector disposed to enable communication between the first data bus and the second data bus. However Devanbu et al. does teach a secure processor enclosed in a tamper proof box that has a single communications input port (bus connector) that allows communications between a first and second bus (fig. 4, col. 6 lines 22-32). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this feature into the system of Yokoyama and Parsons. It would have been obvious to do so since this would increase the difficulty in stealing data from the secure processor.

As for claim 2, Yokoyama discloses the secure terminal according to claim 1, wherein the peripherals further comprises means of display (fig. 1 element 101, col. 4 lines 25-30).

As for claim 3, Yokoyama discloses the secure terminal according to claim 2, wherein the means of display communicates with the principal means by an exchange of encrypted data (fig. 2, fig. 2, col. 4 lines 31-61).

As for claim 4, Yokoyama discloses the secure terminal according to claim 1, wherein the principal means also comprises means of display (fig. 1, col. 4 lines 20-45)

As for claim 5, Yokoyama discloses the secure terminal according to claim 4, wherein the means of display are not certified from the point of view of security (fig. 3, col. 4 line 62 through col. 6 line 65).

As for claim 6, Yokoyama discloses the secure terminal according to claim 1, wherein the means the processing means, the memories, and the keypad are not certified from the point of view of security (fig. 3, col. 4 line 62 through col. 6 line 65).

As for claim 7, Yokoyama discloses the secure terminal according to claim 1, in which the means of reading from/writing to a card and the means of access to a telecommunication network are not certified from the point of view of security (fig. 3, col.

4 line 62 through col. 6 line 65). Yokoyama does not explicitly disclose a peripheral that is a printer. However Parsons does disclose a secure ATM where a non-secure peripheral that is a printer is shown (fig. 7: "Output Devices", col. 5 lines 40-55). Therefore it would have been obvious to incorporate this feature into the system of Yokoyama. It would have been desirable to do so since this would allow the user to obtain a hard copy receipt for transactions made at the ATM.

As for claims 8-14, the claims recite substantially the same limitations as claims 1-7 and are rejected on the same basis as those claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 15-20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul E. Callahan whose telephone number is (571) 272-3869. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9 to 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise, can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2437

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is: (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/PEC/
AU2437

/Emmanuel L. Moise/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2437